



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Nor can the edition be judged merely by a comparison of the parallel passages, even when this is made in detail. It is more than merely a reissue in a new form of Warton's most original contribution to criticism. But the parallels are so numerous that they are worthy of note, and they cannot be ignored by anyone who wishes to form a just estimate of Warton's editorial and critical work. There seems good reason to believe that the edition of Pope's *Works* was undertaken as a "pot-boiler" and as a means of attacking Warburton, rather than because the worthy doctor had anything of importance to add to his earlier, bold exaltation of imaginative poets at the expense of "the great Poet of Reason, the First of Ethical authors in verse."

EDITH J. MORLEY.

University College, Reading, England.

DAVENPORT'S *THE CITY NIGHTCAP* AND GREENE'S *PHILOMELA*

Since the days of Isaac Reed it has been known that the plot of Davenport's play, *The City Nightcap or Crede Quod Habes et Habes*, was taken partly from Robert Greene's novel, *Philomela the Lady Fitzwaters Nightingale*. I have not been able to find, however, that a study has been made of the exact relations between the two works. With a previous interest essentially in Robert Greene I have made such a comparison, aiming to ascertain how far the form of the play was determined by that of the novel.

The City Nightcap consists of two stories, that which Davenport took from Greene, and that which is told in the *Decameron* (Day 7, Novel 7), the two being in striking contrast. The part derived from Greene's novel deals with the jealous husband and the faithful wife; that derived from Boccaccio, with the confident husband and the wanton wife. The two stories are told with little connection between them.

Davenport has changed Greene's proper names. The scene is in Verona instead of in Venice, with the Duke of Verona as cousin to the jealous husband, who in the play is called Lorenzo Medico, instead of Phillippo. The friend, Giovanni Lutesio, of the novel,

is named Phillipò in the play. Philomela is called Abstemia throughout the play—except that when in disguise she is called Millicent. Her brother is the Duke of Venice, whereas in the novel her avenging relative is the Duke of Milan, the father. In the play it is to Milan instead of to Sicily that Philomela, or Abstemia, goes; and it is the Duke's son, Antonio, who plays the part of Arnolfo of the novel. These are the principal changes in names.

The main differences between the play and the novel, so far as the story is concerned, are that in the play the incident of pregnancy is omitted, that the incident of the captain's love is left out, that Abstemia is in the house of a bawd in Milan instead of in the house of the captain at Palermo, that Phillipò instead of being an outside character is the murderer of Antonio's slave, and finally that the story ends happily instead of with Lorenzo's death.

The treatment of the play is much more condensed than that of the novel. The events leading up to the accusation of the wife and friend before the Duke are set forth in one scene in the play. In the novel these same events occupy nearly fifty pages, space which is filled with long descriptions, discourses, speeches, letters, and odes. Each trial of Philomela's virtue is narrated in great detail, with much psychologizing and philosophizing on the part of all the persons concerned. On the whole, indeed, I think it may be said that the play is much better proportioned than the novel. Nearly the whole of the fifth act—the last twelve pages of it—is concerned with events which happen after Philomela (Abstemia) takes upon herself the crime of killing the Duke's son. In the novel, only eight pages are occupied with this part of the story, and the impression is as much that of hurriedness as that of the first part is of tediousness. That is, Greene in *Philomela* has conducted his story in his usual manner—with the fault of disproportion.

Davenport was indebted to Greene for more than the plot of his play. It is interesting to find in *The City Nightcap* many passages which resemble in style work written thirty-five or forty years before, turns of expression and euphuistic mannerisms which by 1624 had become obsolete.¹ To take a few passages at random:

¹ Cf. Mary Augusta Scott, *Elizabethan Translations from the Italian*, 1916, p. 58.—Edd.

When the Elisander-Leaf looks most green,
 The sap is then most bitter.
 —she that is lip-holy
 Is many times heart hollow.

“Your are, sir, just like the Indian hyssop, praised of strangers, for the sweet scent, but hated of the inhabitants, for the injurious quality.”

Lines like these show that Davenport was paying some attention to Greene’s style as well as to his story.

Greene’s story is full of long speeches. When Phillipo summons his wife and friend to trial, he makes a long speech before the Duke. “It is not unknown,” he says, “to the Venetians (right famous Duke and honorable nagistrates of this so worthie a Cittie) how ever since I married this Philomela I have yeilded her such love with reverence, such affection with care, such devoted favours with affected duties, that I did rather honour her as a saint, than regarde her as a wife,” etc. In the play this speech begins as follows :

Thus then,
 (Great sir, grave lords, and honourable auditors
 Of my dishonour) I affirm ’tis known
 To th’ signory of Verona, the whole city. . . .
 How since my marriage with that woman . . .
 I have perform’d
 So fairly all judicial wedlock offices,
 That malice knew not how at my whole actions
 To make one blow, and to strike home. I did rather
 Honour her as a saint, sir, than respect her
 As she was my wife.

When Philomela, in the novel, arises to reply she begins, “Oh! Phillipo Medici, once the lover of Philomela,” just as Abstemia in the play, “Oh! Lorenzo Medici, Abstemia’s lover once,” etc. After the sentence has been passed Philomela says, “Phillipo, I leave thee to the choice of a new love, and the fortunes of a faire wife, who if she prove as honestly amorous towards thee as Philomela, then wrong her not with suspicion, as thou has don me with jealousy: lest she prove too liberal and pay my debts.” In the play, this speech reads,

Farewell, Lorenzo,
 Whom my soul doth love: If you e’er marry,
 May you meet a good wife; so good, that you
 May not suspect her, nor may she be worthy of
 Your suspicion. . . .
 But may she never live to pay my debts.

As to effectiveness, the speeches in the play and the novel are about equal. Those in the play are usually shorter and sometimes more vivid. On the other hand, some of those of the novel have more of genuine emotion.

JOHN CLARK JORDAN.

University of Arkansas.

REVIEWS

Lope de Vega, *Amar sin Saber a Quién*. Edited with notes and vocabulary by MILTON A. BUCHANAN and BERNARD FRANZEN-SWEDELIUS. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920. vii + 202 pp.

This well-known *comedia* by Lope de Vega is quite worthy of a new critical edition, and especially of one with notes and vocabulary in English. The editors' choice of a play was felicitous, and their notes are excellent.

The play does not have an introduction, and in the Preface, which is short, the editors do not attempt to give a study of Lope's life and works. The statement on page iv that "the contents of the two editions" (Parte XXII, Zaragoza, 1630, and Madrid, 1635) "are almost wholly different" refers to the plays that are contained in the two volumes, and not to the texts of *Amar sin saber a quién*. Only two plays are common to both volumes and our play is one of them.

To the references in the Preface may be added one to d'Ouville, *Aimer sans savoir qui*, Paris, 1645.

It would be well, it seems to me, if our editors of Spanish plays would include in their critical editions a brief summary of the main action and a short description of the chief characters. M. Viguier has given succinctly a just appreciation of our play in *Œuvres de P. Corneille*, Grands Ecrivains de la France (Paris, Hachette, 1862), IV, 392 f.

A "partial vocabulary" is given at the end, and, like all such vocabularies, it may be criticized on the ground that some common words are given while some unusual words are omitted.

The following is a list of suggested additions to, or changes in the *Notes*.